



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/488,909	01/21/2000	Hideki Hiura	P4010NP/CSL	5094

7590 06/04/2003
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL
P.O.Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/488,909

Applicant(s)

HIURA ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong N. Hoang

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 353. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 220, 420, and 614. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.C.S. 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, i.e. failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

Base claim 8 recites only a single step and thus encompasses all possible steps for performing a desired function, and the disclosure does not support all possible steps [e.g., see MPEP 706.03(c) and 2164.08(a) Single Means claim].

Claims 8 - 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

The specification is objected to for the following reasons.

35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are as follows.

From the specification, on line 24 of p. 5, and ln. 14 of p. 6, applicants recite "master process".

On line 26 of p. 5, applicants describe "subprocesses" are "locale-specific processes".

However, on line 0 of p. 6 and line 15 of p. 6 applicant recite "locale-dependent processes" for elements 304, 306, 308", and on line 12 of p. 6, applicants recite "locale-specific processes" for the elements 304, 306, 308.

On line 4 of p. 6, applicants recite "locale-specific subprocess" for element 310, but on lines 6 of p. 6, applicants recite "locale-dependent operation" for the element 310. Also, in the drawing, "locale specific encoding" is described for 310.

On line 5 of p. 6, applicants recite "locale-specific subprocess" for elements 312, 314, 316", but on line 16 of p. 6, applicants recite "subprocesses" for elements 312, 314. Also, in the drawing, "locale specific encoding" is described for 312, 314, and 316.

On line 24 of p. 6, applicants recite "locale-dependent subprocesses" for elements 364, 366, 368, 370, and 372. While the drawing, the "locale" recites all of those elements.

On page 7, "subprocesses", "locale-independent operations", "locale-dependent operations", "locale-dependent processes", "locale-specific subprocesses", "locale-dependent subprocesses", "depend operations", "user-dependent processes" are cited.

Also, on page 8, "locale-dependent", "user-dependent process", "subprocess", "user-specific encoding", "locale-dependent process", "user-specific operations", "user-dependent functionality", "concurrent subprocesses", "user-independent operations", "user specific process", "user-specific subprocess" are cited.

The specification and the drawing are confusing. If they refer the same element, they must have the same name; if not then it is not clear what the further elements are referring to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hetherington US patent no. 6,275,810.

As to claim 8, Hetherington teaches instructions (set of instructions, col. 15 lines 60 – 65), mapping of a plurality of concurrent user-specific processes (mapped, col. 6 lines 58 – 67), global process (daemon).

Hetherington does not explicitly teach user-specific process is mapped to virtual addresses that are equivalent to virtual address of the global process.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to recognize that virtual addresses are needed when a process spawning a child process (the endpoint executables are spawned by daemon 24a, col. 5 lines 2 – 10).

As to claim 9, Hetherington teaches the interface of each concurrent user-specific process is identical to the interface of the global process (it is inherent when spawning since each child will inherit property from parent).

As to claim 10, Hetherington as modified teaches the subprocesses being mapped to virtual addresses that are equivalent to virtual addresses for user-specific operations of the global process (explained in claim 8 above).

As to claim 11, Hetherington teaches the return of processing to the global process after execution of the subprocesses is complete (user return to the default locale).

As to claim 12, this is the system claim of claim 8 and 9 above; claim 8 also meets the limitations user-dependent process (user-specific process), virtual memory separator (inherent, which is used to map).

As to claim 13, Hetherington teaches global process is global locale process (daemon 24a spawns all endpoints which run locale applications) and user-dependent process is a locale-dependent process (endpoint computer run locale application).

As to claim 14, Hetherington teaches daemon process (daemon 24a).

As to claim 1, this is the method claim of claim 8 and 9 above, claim 8 also meets overlays (inherent when spawning, the child process will overlay the virtual address of the parent). Hetherington also teaches processing the user-specific operation (running the endpoint application, col. 5 lines 25 – 67).

As to claim 2, Hetherington teaches communication channel (IPC facility 19, col. 12 – 20).

As to claim 3, see claim 9 above.

As to claim 4, see claim 13 above.

As to claim 5, Hetherington teaches the user-specific process is mapped after the user-specific operation is encountered (mapped when user specify the locale calender, col. 6 lines 58 – 65).

As to claim 6, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to recognize that the mapping for the default locale takes place during system configuration.

As to claim 7, see claim 11 above.

As to claim 15 - 21, see claim 1 – 7 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is (703) 605-4239. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-7239 for regular communications and (703)746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)746-7140.

ph
May 30, 2003

Sue Law

Application/Control Number: 09/488,909
Art Unit: 2126

Page 8